MEMORANDUM

TO: CALFED Water Quality Technical Team

FROM: Carol Howe

DATE: October 10, 1996

SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes
CALFED Water Quality Technical Team

Team Members Present: Steve Yaeger, Ron Ott, Rick Woodard, Carol Howe, John Dickey, John Gaston, Tom Maurer, Amy Fowler, Pete Rhoads, Lena Tam, Ted Roefs, John Sanders, Brian Finlayson, Steve Ritchie, Roy Wolfe, Phyllis Fox, Elaine Archibald, Byron Buck, Bob Berger, Joe Karkoski, John Coburn, Doug Jones, K.T. Shum, Karl Stinson, Sandy Oblonsky, Chris Foe
Others Present: Peter Standish-Lee, Jeff Lufer, Wendy Haboason Martin, Nolan Rhem

Need correct spelling

Steve Yaeger began the meeting by explaining how the water quality team fits into the overall CALFED process. Steve emphasized that information on water quality issues would be disseminated beyond this team through technical workshops and briefings. Steve welcomed Rick Woodard (DWR) on board as the new CALFED water quality representative.

Ron Ott followed Steve with a brief presentation of the Water Quality team's mission. It was stated that a goal of the meeting included the formation of a single, functional water quality team who will create a water quality program that is acceptable to all stakeholders. Ron stated that if necessary sub-teams will be formed on specific issues. Results of the sub-teams will be brought back to the joint water quality team. Ron discussed decision points that will be need to be reached in the next couple of water quality meetings. A question was raised on how modeling fits into the process, specifically there was concern that some CALFED modeling work seemed to be running ahead of the water quality work. It was said that the current modeling is very preliminary and is producing only base production numbers. The response on who will do the modeling was DWR and the CALFED CT. The question was raised on who will pay for the recommended water quality actions and the opinion expressed that stakeholders who will have to pay for actions should be at the table (on the water quality team) now. The CALFED CT is exploring this issue and will report back to the team at the next meeting.

Following the team briefing on process members of the CALFED CT (John Dickey, Carol Howe, John Gaston) presented the parameters of concern as identified by the agriculture, ecosystem and urban water quality technical sub-teams. Presentations included definitions of what constituted a "parameter of concern" along with sources of parameters and linkages to other factors such as flow. Each presentation was followed by a question and answer session. Questions raised included:

- Was a judgement made (agricultural) on whether parameters are of concern now or will be in the future? Answer - Parameters are of concern now.

- Are the ranges (agriculture) static or will new trends (in cropping) affect ranges? Answer - Ranges have been set to consider sensitive crops.

- Where does recreational water quality fit into the process? (Posed by the CALFED CT) Answer (By WQ team) -It should be covered by this team but not broadly (i.e. only as relates to fish tissue levels). The team did not consider pathogens to be a known source of concern.

- Why does the geographic scope of the parameters (for ecosystem) end at Suisun Bay? Answer - The scope was inclusive of the Bay if a problem (in the Bay) was fully or partially caused by parameters migrating to the Bay from the Delta.

- What are the sources of $NH4^+$ (agricultural background, NPDES discharges)? Answer - Both are potential sources but loadings have not been established.

- Have you considered atrazine (ecosystem)? Answer - No, it was not raised by sub-team as a parameter of concern.

- Why are MCL's (ecosystem) on the ecosystem criteria list? Answer - The rationale was that any parameter that is exceeding the criteria for human health impacts (at the top of the food chain) is probably having a detrimental impact on aquatic organisms. (This criteria will be referred to the ecosystem sub-team for decision)

- Have you considered rural groundwater quality? NO_3? Answer - Areas where groundwater is consumed for drinking water purposes are beyond CALFED's geographic scope.

- Has the isohaline issue been addressed? Answer - In-Delta water quality actions (e.g., South Delta Program, etc.) and flow related actions address this issue. Storage and conveyance alternatives will also address.

The following opinions were expressed:

- Agricultural overhead should include the Delta as a location.

<- Rick, I know what? Don't know what this means - do you? Have I written it wrong?

- A parameter of concern may be MBTE which is being seen and measured in reservoirs. There is a State action level for this parameter but no MCL. It is thought to come from boat discharges.

- Central Coast and North South Bay to export area should be added to data station list.

- Handouts for ecosystem should be clarified to include Delta sources of metals (i.e. selenium refineries in Bay, agricultural drainage in Delta)

- The mercury source in river sediments and Delta sediments may be from recent erosion of cinnabar derived soils in coast ranges.

- Need more clarity on what "degrades rapidly" means for pesticides (i.e. relative to what and why does it cause toxicity if it degrades so rapidly?).

- The third alternative (isolated facility) needs a urban water quality placeholder for it's inlet.

The discussion then focused on the 31 proposed CALFED Water Quality actions. The combined agricultural, urban and ecosystem action benefit/constraint list was presented to the water quality technical team. The idea of ranking each action as having high, medium or low potential for water quality improvements was discussed. It was decided that each sub-team would jointly decide on the ranking of each action (by conference call) and the CALFED CT would compile the results for the next meeting. The sub-teams will also document pertinent assumptions that were used when ranking actions (i.e., an action's current wording states that it's purpose is to reduce the concentration of a parameter(s) but the sub-team decides that the action should say reduction in load of a parameter and hence makes their ranking on load reduction potential). It was stated that actions would not be dropped as a result of this preliminary ranking.

Some other issues raised in association with the actions included:

- Whether their would be one water quality program or three different programs for each alternative. The CALFED CT stated that as currently envisaged their would be one common Water Quality program that would have slight variations for each alternative.

- Salt management is a 0-sum game and that no action (except land retirement)will have a significant impact on the salt load at Vernalis.

- Quantities of dilution water stated in the actions may not be appropriate relative to need.

- The distribution of benefits and costs among stakeholders will be critical later in the process.

It was decided that for the next water quality meeting the CALFED CT would present acceptable ranges (agreed upon by the sub-teams) for each parameter at appropriate geographic points in the Central Valley/Bay-Delta system.